

## The Curtis-Reed Bill

REV. PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

*Reprinted from "Columbia"*

THE late Vice-President Marshall, one of the wisest men of his generation, once said that he had lived long enough in Washington to see many a bureau grow up into a bedroom set. There is hardly a more fertile soil in the world than Washington for the growth of commissions into bureaus and of bureaus into departments.

Within recent years the bureaucrat has been turning his attention to the elementary and secondary schools. A hasty survey has convinced him that unless the Federal Government takes them over we shall soon be a nation of illiterates.

That is precisely what he tried to do a little more than seven years ago when on October 10, 1918, he and a group of like-minded individuals presented to Congress the famous old Smith-Towner bill. It was rather a complicated document in some respects, but its aim was very radical, yet very simple. It proposed to centralize the administration and control of the local schools in a Federal Department of Education. How was this to be done?

The bill provided that a Department of Education should be established, headed by a Secretary of Education, with a seat in the Cabinet. He was to take over the powers and duties pertaining to the Commissioner of Education, and through means put at his disposal by the bill was to begin the work of reforming education in the United States. The bill further authorized the annual appropriation by Congress of \$100,000,000, and here the plot begins to thicken. This money was to be distributed by the Secretary to the States, but under conditions laid down by the Secretary himself. Thus a State which wished to share in the appropriation was obliged to submit its school policy, including its courses of study and its plans for the training of teachers, to the Secretary. Should the Secretary approve the policy as submitted, he would certify that the State might share in the appro-

priation. But the Secretary could withhold his approbation. Stripped of all verbiage, the bill authorized a political appointee at Washington to draw up the courses of study for every publicly-supported school in the United States, and to enforce his orders by his control of the Federal subsidy, since in case of conflict with the Secretary the States would be obliged to yield.

Looking back over the conflict that immediately ensued, it is amazing to reflect upon the claim of the bureaucrats that this plan in no sense involved Federal control of the schools. Two learned gentlemen, Dr. George D. Strayer, of Columbia University, and Dr. John A. Keith, of the Pennsylvania State Normal School, even went so far as to write a book to show that the Smith-Towner bill did not endanger local educational freedom; but the country remained unconvinced. Educators of the standing of Presidents Butler of Columbia, Goodnow of Johns Hopkins, Kinley of Illinois, Judson of Chicago, Hibben of Princeton, and Hadley, then of Yale, protested vigorously against a scheme which would establish bureaucratic domination at Washington, and drag the schools of the country into the mire of partisan political strife. In Congress, such men as the late Speaker Clark, and Senators Borah, King and Stanley, attacked the bill as a most pernicious attempt to establish an unconstitutional control over powers and rights plainly reserved by the Constitution to the States. Presented year after year in Congress the bill was never reported out of committee. It was too clearly unconstitutional.

Amendment followed amendment, none changing the essential unconstitutionality of the Federal control scheme, because all left the annual \$100,000,000 appropriation untouched. Finally the present form known as the Curtis-Reed bill was agreed upon. It establishes a Federal Department of Education, but eliminates the annual appropriation. Under the Curtis-Reed plan the Department is presented merely as an investigating, fact-finding agency, exercising no control over the schools within the States.

The question naturally suggests itself, "Why, then, an Executive Department if there is nothing to control?"

The reason is very simple; it is found in Marshall's pungent remark on the bureau and the bedroom set. The bureaucrats are working for a Department without con-

trol, because until a Department is created it will be impossible to establish a Department with all the powers of Federal control enumerated in the old Smith-Towner bill. They know that you cannot load a gun until you have a gun, and the gun is provided by the Curtis-Reed bill.

In plain language, the old Smith-Towner bill was open and honest; the Curtis-Reed is furtive and fraudulent. There is no need whatever of a Department if it is merely to gather statistics, and there is not a single activity specified by the Curtis-Reed bill which could not be administered with complete satisfaction by a properly-staffed bureau. *This alone is a sufficient reason for the rejection of the Curtis-Reed bill.*

But the history of the campaign for the Federal Education bill shows clearly that the real purpose of the movement is to do away with the constitutional principle which reserves the control of schools within the States to the local authorities, through the use of Federal subsidies.

It is my conviction, then, that control of the schools by Congress is the real purpose sought through the Curtis-Reed bill. For the sake of the record, however, I may briefly outline the arguments usually offered by supporters of the measure.

1. "This is the only country in the world that has no Minister or Secretary of Education."

On the contrary, we have more Ministers of Education than any country in the world, for we have forty-eight, one in every State. In addition, we have thousands of local school-board members, city and county superintendents of education, and their associates, and a Bureau of Education at Washington.

2. "The dignity of education requires that it be represented in the Cabinet."

Departments are not created to administer functions and activities that possess "dignity," but solely to administer functions and activities with which the Constitution permits or directs the Federal Government to concern itself. Religion, too, has "dignity"; shall we therefore have a Federal Secretary of Religion?

3. "The United States is almost the lowest of all countries in the scale of literacy."

I have repeatedly asked for proof of this statement, but none has been forthcoming, because there is none.

4. "Illiteracy is growing at an alarming rate in the United States."

Absolutely false; it has been steadily decreasing for at least half a century, and there is every reason to suppose that it will continue to decrease. Figures published by the Federal Government (Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1916, No. 35) show that in 1890 the percentage of illiteracy was 13.7. In 1900, it was 10.7. By 1910, it had fallen to 7.7, and the Federal Census of 1920 reported a decrease to 6.

5. "Public education in the United States does not receive adequate financial support."

If it does not, the Curtis-Reed bill will not mend matters, because it professes to reject the principle of Federal aid. However, the Financial Abstract of the United States shows that the total annual expenditures for the public schools *alone* rose from \$78,094,687 in 1880 to \$140,506,715 in 1890; to \$214,964,618 in 1900; to \$426,250,434 in 1910; to \$1,045,053,545 in 1920; and to \$1,580,671,296 in 1922. There is not a single State in the Union which is unable to support its schools, and a majority of the States meet the requirements, as far as financial aid is concerned, fairly well. Certainly, no country in the world spends as much upon schools, public or private, as the United States.

6. "Some States seem unable to conduct their schools properly."

Even were this true, the Federal Government could not remedy matters, since under the Constitution, no branch of the Federal Government is vested with power to administer, control or reform the school system of any State. When Congress begins to usurp powers reserved to the States on the ground that some States will not or cannot exercise them, constitutional government is at an end.

There are few questions of deeper importance before the American people today. As Dr. J. Gresham Machen, of the Princeton Theological Seminary, has written: "If you give the bureaucrats the children you might just as well give them everything else." The Constitution of the United States forbids Congress to interfere with the schools of any State. Let us not endanger that wise prohibition by suffering a parcel of bureaucrats to succeed in establishing a Federal Department of Education.

## College Men and Public Service

*An address delivered at Holyoke, Massachusetts, to the Holy Cross Club of Western Massachusetts at the reception in honor of three graduates recently elected mayors of Holyoke, Chicopee and Northampton.*

HON. DAVID I. WALSH

THIS is indeed a unique occasion, a testimonial in honor of three young men recently commissioned to administer the municipal affairs of three progressive, and incidentally, adjoining American cities. Unique, indeed, in the circumstance that all three Mayors are College men and each of them an alumnus of the same College, Holy Cross, that we hail as our Alma Mater.

You have assembled to give them public assurance of your pride in their political success; of your sympathetic interest in their new sphere of usefulness and distinction; and your unwavering support of their endeavors to make a clean and honorable public record. I join with you in congratulating each of them and the citizens of their respective cities who have given them an opportunity for public distinction and leadership that few are privileged to enjoy.

It has been alleged that the electorates of cities do not respond favorably to the candidacies of College men in municipal elections. The reserve, the dignity, the absence of bombastic and exaggerated speech, which are the natural sequence of College training, suggest to some a lack of sympathy with and intimate appreciation of the problems of the masses and frequently prevent a popular and successful appeal to the electorate. The citizens that have called you to the highest honor a city electorate bestows have certainly manifested no distrust of the College graduate.

May I, as an older brother in the public service, accept this occasion to make some observations upon the position and responsibility of College men in public life? Foremost, let us understand that the responsibilities and standards to which you will be held are altogether higher and very properly of a more exacting nature because you are University men. The excuse that may be pleaded in mitigation of the inefficiency, short-comings and mal-ad-

ministration of the public official of limited education will not be for you a defence. The fine record that has been achieved, and the extensive and beneficial contributions that have been made to good government, by those who have come into the public service with meager educational advantages justifies the public expectation and demand for service of a superior type from trained College men.

What have the public a right to anticipate, aye command, from the College man in the public service? A trained and disciplined mind, which should assure sound and sane judgments; a knowledge, at least a theoretical one, of the general social and political problems of life; exalted ideals of public service. In a word, the College man should offer to his constituents ideas and ideals formulated and stimulated through years of study and training. In addition to your scholarship, your patriotic training, your College has equipped you—with special emphasis—with a knowledge of the teachings of Christ, the laws of love, charity and justice which He preached.

No College man in the public service will be content with becoming a prominent figure in local politics, a stump-speaker, an influential disposer of patronage, or the winner of well-paid and conspicuous official positions, unless these things bring him real powers of usefulness to his fellow-citizens and entitle him to be remembered gratefully by posterity, rather than merely to bask in the sunshine of a passing and perhaps partisan popularity. Put briefly, a College man should aspire, in the public service, to manifest the qualities of a statesman rather than those of a mere politician. The profession of the public service viewed in this light stands in a class entirely distinct from the commercial or self-centered professions. In my judgment, the public service ranks second only to the ministry, among the callings of self-abnegation and service. The physician ministers to the sufferings of individuals; the lawyer seeks justice among special groups; but the public servant promotes or retards the public health and the opportunities of life for all; advances or prostitutes the administration of justice and respect for authority.

The College man who chooses the political career as a promising opportunity of service to his fellow-man, needs, like the soldier, equipment and training. He should spe-

cialize in a knowledge of Government, its relationship to the individual, its functions, and its purposes. In a special way he should thoroughly familiarize himself with the age-long internal conflict in all the governments instituted by men between class privilege and popular rights. He should come to understand fully that the destructive tendencies of a materialistic philosophy and a paternalistic socialism, and all forms of discontent, are to be counteracted not by a reactionary policy of repression, but by promptly remedying all just causes of complaint, and offering to the people access on equal terms to all the avenues of security, success and happiness. He should be alert enough to detect the deep-rooted force and insidious conduct of those who challenge the promotion of the common good in order that they may personally benefit and profit. He should develop a manly independence; suppress loud-mouthed and demagogic utterances; be inflexible, but gentle.

With Abraham Lincoln's noble idea of "Malice toward none, and charity for all," he should be no partisan puppet, but in reality a free agent able to rise superior to threats and blandishments alike and fit to weigh dispassionately in the interests of all the people the conflicting claims and argument of the representatives of organized greed, of organized malcontents, and of organized selfseekers, and all the other contending elements of our complex civilization. His College training, knowledge of history, the biographies of great statesmen, have shown him the importance of understanding the task before him in public life. More than all this, he should not be so unsophisticated as not to appreciate the foes he is to meet and the entanglements he must shun.

The College man who chooses the public service is doomed to disappointment if his aim is merely selfish. If he is tempted by the salary of the office he holds, he will find that unforeseen but necessary expenses reduce the actual income far below what may be expected as the reward of like abilities and application in private life. The prestige of official rank will soon cease to satisfy unless one is a confirmed egotist. Popular applause he will find to be adulterated by flattery and embittered by unmerited and partisan criticism and abuse. But what is far harder to bear is the misunderstandings of friends and the failure

of honest and well-meaning citizens to appreciate and support sincere efforts to serve the public. All this he must bear, often alone; if he is not prepared to do so, he had better keep out of public service. Again and again he will have to turn to his conscience for support, strength and inspiration; in the end, it may be his only reward. His greatest compensation will be the consciousness, after he is out of public office, that he has to the best of his ability promoted the material welfare of constituents, served with even-handed justice, and obtained some relief for those whose weakness calls for forms of government encouragement and protection with which the rich and powerful may well dispense.

Success in the public service is most sure to come to him possessed with an overmastering desire to contribute to the happiness and well-being of all sorts and conditions of men; together with a complete absorption of the spirit which has made the teachings of religion in all the ages a foe of oppression and the defender and comforter of the poor and oppressed. In a word, the public service should be the goal of the crusader, not the prize of the soldier of fortune.

It is idle to think that there can be any public service that is satisfactory even to one's self, to say naught to one's constituents, without the common virtues of honesty, veracity, loyalty and justice. These are basic. Indeed, the possession of them ought not to be a matter of commendation,—they should be assumed. The ideal to which the University graduate should aim is more inspiring, it is the possession of those more transcendent qualities, love of service and the promotion of the welfare of humanity as a whole.

There has been extravagant criticism in recent years of municipal governments, but thoughtful and able students of City Governments more recently assert that there has been an advance in efficiency and good administration in municipal, while there has been some deterioration in state governments. Much of the criticism of Government, I believe, is by those seeking to exploit public officials, and failing in their object become propagandists to discredit that which they are unable to use to their selfish advantage. In my opinion, the propaganda against the United States Senate in recent years has come from such



sources, because they found the Senate outspoken, independent and adamant against certain forces seeking without free and open debate to exploit their fellow-men and promote selfish schemes to their own purposes.

The American people are being drugged to death to-day by propaganda. Some of this propaganda is to the effect that the only test of good government is economy. Of course, everybody agrees that wastes are to be eliminated in our National, State and City Governments, but the highest province of Government is not economy. It is, rather, to take care of the unfortunate, to promote justice, to administer the problems of our time with courage and vision. That official serves best and wisest who serves not for the passing hour, but who is capable of looking over a long period of years, providing reasonable safeguards to promote the public health, to prevent the strong from oppressing the weak, to advance education by establishing schools and recreation centers, to maintain well trained and public-spirited departments of the Government in order to protect the public against losses of life and property and crime; to encourage, by the building of highways and transportation facilities, attractive home building, and easier means for the exchange of commerce between the residents of communities.

There is a difference between economy and honest expenditure. The political philosophy of the reactionary is often obscured by declarations of economy. Associated frequently with the principles of economy is the bestowal of special privileges, the enactment of discriminatory laws, and the withholding of interest in the proper solution of important social problems.

The College man must give unfaltering support to that program of Government which exalts service to humanity over and above service to any individual, class, nation, or even race. The public servant who aspires to high leadership, who strives to do away with the war between individuals, classes, nations and races, which constitutes the heart of the social problem of our day, must be imbued himself, and stimulate it among others with a religion of love of justice and service to his fellow-men.

You have been called upon to assist in solving some of the problems of municipal government. In the beginning of the nineteenth century scarcely four per cent

of the population of the United States lived in cities; while, to-day, over fifty per cent. live under urban conditions; and nearly one-fourth of our population dwells in fifty great cities. If you examine the causes of the growth of cities in America, it will become clearly evident that these causes are almost wholly economic. Not the love of amusement, not facilities for education and culture, have been responsible for the growth of our cities, but certain compelling economic institutions of our time. The City Government touches the life and character of every one; therefore, the economic conditions under which the people live in the city have touched life at every point. It is claimed that the economic system which has produced our cities hampers and restricts the social and spiritual development of mankind. If this is so, the sooner it is recognized and understood, the better it will be for the world. If you are not able to assist in the solution of these economic problems, you at least should know of them and bring the influence and power of your office to broadening and enlarging the social and spiritual development of the city dweller. Poverty, disease, ignorance, which lurk in our larger cities, rob man not only of happiness, but also of the higher powers and aspirations of life.

Let me tabloid what I conceive to be the essential qualities for public service and which above all the Catholic College man should confess and defend:

1. He should be honest by nature, intellectually and financially.
2. He should be possessed of high ideals, the ideals which in all the ages have produced patriots.
3. His words and acts should always be the result of deep-rooted convictions, never the result of selfish and material considerations.
4. He should be serious-minded, possessed of an unwavering sincerity of purpose.
5. He should be able to say Yes or No, and avoid indecision and procrastination.
6. He should take the people into his confidence,—be frank, open and candid with them and their problems.
7. Above all, he should be a just man.

The great test of College manhood, however, in public life, is the use that he makes of honors, money and pros-

perity. In adversity every individual must work and must attend to his affairs because of the burden of economic necessity. In prosperity, however, the true fiber of the individual is shown. Then is revealed what his ideals are, what he considers most worthwhile. Then is disclosed whether he is merely a time server, a utilitarian, or one who is giving an example of sobriety in authority, leading in the planning of the City's affairs and the use of the people's moneys for those things that are permanently advantageous to the City. What are these? The development of those great common assets, wholesome institutions for the aged, the poor, and the sick, good schools, beautiful public buildings, fine highways, clean streets, well directed playgrounds and recreation centers for the young, economic administration, even-handed justice, efficient police and fire forces, the service of competent subordinates,—these are the great common assets which not only induce men to establish industries and to buy property in a community, but hold them there with their children as permanent residents.

To-night, your Holy Cross brothers here and afar greet and salute you:

"Go, therefore, and resolve to build a city that hath foundations,  
'Whose Builder and Maker is God.'"

## Louis Pasteur

REV. JOSEPH C. SASIA, S.J.

*Reprinted from the San Francisco "Monitor"*

**I**T stands to the credit of the founders of modern science, the master minds of the last three centuries, not less than 267 in number, that their discoveries did not interfere with their faith in God and their belief in the spirituality and immortality of the human soul.

Such a credit must also be given to Louis Pasteur, one of the brightest lights of the nineteenth century. He was indeed a great discoverer, an eminent benefactor of the human race, an undying honor to France. But he was, at the same time, a faithful child of the Catholic Church, in whose bosom he lived and died. He showed by his example that the practice of Christian faith is perfectly compatible with the highest scientific attainments a man can reach. A rapid survey of some of his most valuable discoveries amply justifies all the eulogies lavished on this great inventor, an indefatigable student of the mysteries of nature. He is universally recognized as an investigator of the very first order. But it was his discovery in 1877, that certain diseases are due to the presence of minute, microscopic organisms, the bacteria, bacilli, or microbes, that first won for him a world-wide renown and opened a new field for successful, both medical and surgical, treatment.

Hence he laid down the principle: "Each infectious malady is produced by the development in the organism of a special microbe." To the germ discovery of Pasteur are also due all the modern advances in antiseptic surgery which is saving so many lives. Henceforth Pasteur's beneficent mission was to detect and subdue those deadliest foes of humanity, causing more victims than the bullets of the battlefield. His successful investigations moved the French Government to appeal to him to study the silk-worm disease, whose ravages threatened to ruin altogether the silk industry in France. His researches in this line are marked by their brilliancy and epoch-making results. He soon ascertained the cause of the calamity, which was to be averted by careful segregation of healthy

worms from such as were found infected with the disease discovered through microscopic inspection. He demonstrated the bacterial origin of anthrax, splenic fever, a contagious disease that destroyed thousands of cattle, and made known its practically infallible cure. He also detected the cause of fowl cholera, prescribed its remedy and saved to the farmers millions of dollars every year.

He successfully disproved the old doctrine of spontaneous generation and showed experimentally before the members of the French Academy that, if the inorganic substances supposed to produce life are completely sterilized by a sufficiently high temperature, no life will appear. To name but one practical result, the whole canning trade, so extensive in California, depends for its success on Pasteur's discovery of the cause of fermentation and incidental corruption, which are excluded by the heating process he suggested. The substances to be preserved, as well as the vessels to hold them, are sterilized by heat brought to the boiling point, thus destroying the germs within them. The vessels are then so closed that germs cannot enter them. Hence all putrefaction is eliminated and the substances are indefinitely preserved.

Another of Pasteur's most beneficent discoveries was that of the cure of rabies, hydrophobia, a fatal disease accompanied by most dreadful sufferings of its unhappy victims. By his process of anti-rabic treatment, the person affected with rabies from the bite of a mad dog is inoculated with attenuated virus, a milder form of the very poison from which the patient is suffering. This is done by hypodermic injection of emulsion made from the brain of a rabid animal, repeated in gradually stronger concentration. Strange to say, the cure consists in this, that the patient is treated with the same deadly poison that causes hydrophobia, which is rendered impotent to injure those that have been prepared by accurately increased doses of a less virulent nature.

His first experiment was on an Alsatian boy, who had been bitten in fourteen places by a rabid dog. The treatment was applied and a perfect cure was the result. No better proof of Pasteur's successful discovery can be alleged than the fact that out of 305 cases he treated for rabies, there was only a single death, that of a girl brought to him thirty-seven days after being bitten. He regarded

the case as hopeless from the first, and only undertook it at the pressing request of the distressed parents. The happy results of this treatment are now indisputable, but it is of the utmost importance that it should be applied as soon as possible after the injury, as the prospects of cure grow less in proportion to the delay. Here Pasteur evidently applied the doctrine of the homeopathic medical school, based on the principle that like ailments are cured by like ailments. It prescribes in minute doses such remedial agents as would produce in a healthy person symptoms similar to those manifested in the disease to be treated. By this form of vaccination he produces in the patient a mild disease which effectually protects him from the scourge of anthrax or splenic fever, of diphtheria, rabies and other diseases. But such virus, administered to healthy animals unprepared by previous treatment, causes inevitable death. Pasteur's vaccines, serums, or antitoxins, carefully administered by expert physicians, prove to-day to be of the utmost service in the treatment of several contagious and dangerous ailments. Many were the honors showered upon the distinguished investigator. One of the highest bestowed on him by his grateful country was his reception into the French Academy. On that occasion he had, according to custom, to pronounce a memorial speech on his predecessor, who happened to be a Positivist. Now Positivism is the doctrine holding that all investigation, study and inquiry into causes, even into the first cause, the Creator, is fruitless and hopeless. Pasteur undertook to refute it by showing that Positivism is in open contradiction with its own principles; for, while professing to be founded on the undeniable facts of experience it brushes aside the most positive and undeniable of all facts, namely, that mankind, as a whole, has always believed in God and found the greatest support in religion. Ernest Renan was chosen to reply to Pasteur's inaugural address, but the brittle arguments of the notorious apostate were utterly powerless before the iron logic of the great Catholic investigator.

Though many years have elapsed since his death, yet the discoveries he made on behalf of suffering humanity still survive in all their primitive vigor, being firmly established by a long series of successful experiments, the infallible test of the soundness of his principles. They are

to-day encouraging the studies and labors of a large band of scientific workers, who hold out the promise that infectious diseases may soon be conquered, if not entirely stamped out. These men, inspired by the marvelous achievements of the French investigator, study the various contagious diseases, and their efforts are being rewarded by the discovery of the cause and prevention of diphtheria, tetanus and yellow fever, so disastrous to mankind.

We must not, however, overlook the fact that the great bacteriologist, to gain assent to his views, had to combat what was perhaps the most persistent opposition that ever confronted a discoverer. The magnificent Paris Institute, which bears his name, with its thoroughly equipped laboratories, attended by an ever increasing number of his disciples, is the permanent monument bearing testimony to Pasteur's glorious victory. Some wise-acre said that several of Pasteur's discoveries were due to chance. We answer that though this depreciatory charge is false, it is well to remember the saying that, "In the field of observation chance only favors the trained mind." Lord Lister, an eminent English physician, had this to say at Pasteur's jubilee celebration: "Truly, there does not exist in the entire world any individual to whom the medical sciences owe more than they do to you. Thanks to you, surgery has undergone a complete revolution, which has deprived it of its terrors, and has extended, almost without limit, its efficacious power."

## Crusaders, Ancient and Modern

G. K. CHESTERTON

*Reprinted from "The Record"*

I KNOW nothing about the society that calls itself the Crusaders; though it would nowadays be a very poor spirited journalist who allowed that fact to discourage him from writing an article on the subject. But, anyhow, I do not know enough about them to denounce them or defend them or glorify them, or otherwise take sides in the matter. They may be a Round Table shining with the spirit of Sir Galahad. They may be a reactionary conspiracy, dark and disdainful with the spirit of Sylla. They may possibly be a group of harmless gentlemen with a healthy taste for dressing up. But whatever they are, there is no doubt about what they are called. They are called Crusaders; and in the light of that single and simple and unquestioned fact the report of the address delivered to them by Dean Inge who acted as their religious adviser makes most extraordinary reading. It is always possible, of course, that the most extraordinary elements are in the report, rather than the address: and that it was more extraordinary to read than to hear. In that case we transfer the curiosity of literature to another calling, and substitute for an amazement at deans an amazement at daily papers. But anyhow the utterance or the importance given to it, seems very strange.

According to the report, the Dean rose to congratulate all these gentlemen on having become Crusaders, and devoted his remarks chiefly to showing what detestable people Crusaders had generally been, and, inferentially, what a deplorable thing it was to be a Crusader. This journalistic impression may have been exaggerated. But it seems clear that the Dean did chiefly devote himself to complimenting the Crusaders by abusing the Crusades. He said that the Crusades were lamentable and shameful incidents in history, which had created hatred between creed and creed and left a tragic trail of religious war; that was apparently the upshot of what he said. And it seems to me an odd thing to say to a body



that had christened itself after those creators of bitterness, that had taken its very name from those lamentable events, to men who had the whole of the history to choose from and chose certain historic figures as their patron saints, only to be told by their own temporary chaplain that their patron saints were hateful heresiarchs of hate.

A word may be said later about this historical view of those historical figures. It is not merely that some of us might suggest other aspects of the individuals; that it would hardly be just to represent St. Louis as merely hating, or even Godfrey de Bouillon as merely hateful. There might also be a great deal more to say about the general social and spiritual issue of the great religious wars. There would be something to be said about the justice of the cause—and of the effect. The Dean might be respectfully referred to another Dean, whose name was Stubbs, and who possibly knew as much history as the Dean now in question. His justification, and even glorification, of the motives and moral fruitfulness of the Crusades has often been quoted. And Dean Stubbs wrote in the midst of a Victorian modernism, fully content with modern things, and much less appreciative than we are of medieval things. But I shall come back to this general historical question presently. At the moment I merely remark on the oddity of a man delivering a denunciation of the Crusades to encourage a revival of the Crusaders.

It would be odd if the Free Churches, organising a Puritan revival, had started a club called the Ironsides (named after the famous troopers of Cromwell), and if they had then opened the proceedings by getting an Irish priest to deliver a flaming curse upon all Cromwell's soldiers for their cruelties at Wexford and Drogheda. It would be singular if a Stuart revival in the Scottish Highlands, with a pageant of the loyal clans organised by a club called the Jacobites, had as its spiritual director an aged Calvinist minister of the Covenanting tradition, who told them nothing but horrible stories about the black deviltries of Claverhouse, and the savagery of the clans after the victories of Montrose. Yet there seems to be something odd about our use of medieval terms, by which similar incongruities are not felt as incongruous. And that fact has a very curious interest in connection with the whole attitude of the modern mind about the medieval revival.

In spite of all the prejudices and perversions of historians, in spite of the crude traditions of commercial journalism, a sentiment of sympathy with the chivalric ages remains in common speech; and it is not yet possible to use the title of Godfrey and Tancred as a term of abuse. The term Crusader or Crusade has sunk deep into the language of the English people and spread outwards to the widest popular applications. We might say it has grown great enough to be spelt with a small "c."

Nowadays a man does not call himself a Puritan unless he is specially and seriously in sympathy with the Puritans. Otherwise the mere reference to a person or a programme as "puritanical" is certainly a term of popular reproach. A man does not call himself a Jacobite unless he is a Jacobite. He does not use so defiant a definition unless he is really prepared to maintain that the Stuart cause was the hope of the nation. Otherwise, to be called a Jacobite, or even compared to a Jacobite, is to be compared to something hopeless. Men claiming the names of these seventeenth-century sects or parties are ready with definitions, because they feel they are on the defensive. They are ready to explain their names, because they feel that their names do not explain themselves. They feel that their names are hardly very popular or acceptable in themselves. But the notion of "crusading" has become picturesque and yet familiar in itself; and nobody can effectively use it, even the people who hate it. Not in vain have hundreds of forgotten romances about Sir Bevis and Sir Bleoberis and Sir Brastias rolled through an eternal forest; not in vain was great Godfrey set with Arthur and Alexander among the Nine Worthies; not in vain did our fathers tell and retell a thousand times how the swaying towers of timber went up for the storming of Jerusalem. The dead leaves of that forest were trampled till they made a soil; the thousand tongues of old gossip about Godfrey and the Nine Worthies have filled the world with echoes too confused to be ever silenced; and men remembered Godfrey when Allenby entered Jerusalem, while few were visiting the graves of Calvinist martyrs in the Netherlands or looking for the monument of Marshal Keith.

Cervantes did not really succeed in smiling Spain's chivalry away; he only succeeded in adding another admi-

nable hero, for whom we all feel that we can express our admiration best by calling him chivalrous. The very persistence of the words is a tribute to the tradition. It is true that words have occasionally a way of getting mixed; and it always strikes me as odd that "chivalrous" and "cavalier," which both merely mean a horseman, should sometimes be put to such opposite purposes. For to treat a lady in a cavalier way is not exactly the same as to treat her in a chivalrous way. But even an accident like this might be an illustration of what I mean; for we retain "cavalier" as the seventeenth-century mode or memory. And the seventeenth century was a time of swaggering factions and professional soldiery; and the medieval ideal, at any rate, was really more pious and gentle and universal. Anyhow, the point is here that the medieval ideal, though never realised, sank deep into our idiom and instinct. Hence even the names of its parties are now not merely party names; they can be used by anybody in a common fashion and rather a confused fashion, as in the case under consideration. Men have fallen into the habit of talking about a Crusade for anything as against anything. I remember a paper called the *Crusader* that was in favour of Prohibition; which would have puzzled Richard or Raymond not a little. Considering that the Moslems were Prohibitionists and the Crusaders were not, the title was a little odd. But, as I say, men talk now of a Crusade against anything. They are quite capable of talking about a Crusade against the Cross.

Very little historical information would be needed to tell the Dean that it was not Peter the Hermit, but Mahomet, who took the responsibility of rending in two the Pax Romana of religion and leaving a legacy of religious war. Hundreds of years before Peter was born or thought of, the Moslem fanaticism had poured over the Roman provinces. Hundreds of years before any European dreamed of going on a Crusade, Islam appeared in arms in the central fields of France. If it had not been broken then by the blow of Charles the Hammer, they might have substituted their creed and culture for ours, to the radiant satisfaction of all liberal and latitudinarian Deans. There would have appeared everywhere that emancipation of woman which has always accompanied the Seraglio, that encouragement of sculptors and por-

trait-painters which is peculiar to the Iconoclasts, that sympathetic rule enjoyed by the Armenians, and so on. But the Moslem attack failed: and was finally followed by a counter-attack. This also partly failed; but it was called the Crusades.

## Galileo

G. K. CHESTERTON

*Reprinted from "G. K.'s Weekly"*

WHEN we of a certain philosophy open the papers and find them full of articles about Science and Religion or the Future of the Churches, we know pretty well the scope of the discussion. Our eye travels rapidly down the column until it picks out the capital G at the beginning of Galileo: and having seen that this item has been duly inserted, we are satisfied and turn to our ordinary avocations. The people who write these articles can be relied on not to disappoint us. And as Galileo is evidently the only astronomer they have ever heard of, and the stricture upon him by the Inquisitors the only decision of the Church they have ever heard of, it is natural that they should judge a great many matters in the light of this incident, so far as they are acquainted with it. I will not attempt here to extend that acquaintance at any length. I might state a number of things about Galileo that are not without interest. I might point out that whatever else he was, he was not the man they are admiring; the man who suffered for making the first suggestion that the earth goes round the sun. I might advance the paradox that the Copernican theory was propounded by Copernicus. I might point out that Copernicus taught astronomy at Rome under the orthodox official authority. I might point out that long before even Copernicus stated it, it had been suggested in the very middle of the Middle Ages by Cusa; and that the persecuting Church proceeded to persecute him by making him a Cardinal.